

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in the application. Claims 10-17 and 23-30 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-8 and 18-21 stand rejected and claims 9 and 22 are objected to.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

According to the Office Action, claims 1-8 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0179742 (hereinafter "Ogier").

To anticipate a claim the reference must either expressly or inherently described *each and every element* as set forth in the claim. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant's independent claim 1 recites: "providing a plurality of access points (APs) in the network with an assigned channel of operation and a pre-configured nearest-neighbor table comprised of records, where each record includes at least a first field identifying a nearest neighbor AP and a second field identifying said nearest neighbor AP's channel of operation" (emphasis added).

On page 3 of the Office Action it is alleged that Ogier teaches the claimed features in paragraphs 97-104 and 203-212. However, in reviewing the cited paragraphs of Ogier, nowhere is there any teaching or even a suggestion of an assigned channel of operation and a second field identifying said nearest neighbor AP's channel of operation.

Ogier only describes the neighbor-node identity field 208 holding the IPv4 address of a neighbor node of the corresponding source node (Para. 204). Ogier does not suggest identifying the nearest neighbor AP's channel of operation. In fact Ogier does not even mention an AP's channel of operation. Ogier only mentions broadcast channels and unicast channels, which are

not related to applicant's claimed AP's channel of operation.

Applicant's claim 1 also recites: "performing a prioritized search by said STA by first searching in each of said nearest neighbor AP's channel of operation as identified in said transmitted nearest-neighbor table to locate at least one candidate AP to form a new association with in said handoff."

The Office Action again points to Ogier, Paragraphs 97-104 and 203-212. However, Ogier again fails to suggest the claimed features. There is only a description of updating the neighbor lists according to status changes, for example, as described in Ogier Paragraph 99. After a change in network status the node in Ogier apparently re-computes parent nodes by running a shortest-path algorithm such as Dijkstra's algorithm.

There is no suggestion in Ogier of first searching in each of said nearest neighbor AP's channel of operation as claimed. Nor is there any suggestion of at least one candidate AP to form a new association with in said handoff. In fact, Ogier appears to only mention a hand-off in paragraphs 66 and 71.

From the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Ogier fails to teach many of the features recited in independent claim 1 and, therefore, cannot anticipate the claimed invention and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 18 is directed to a system for minimizing a communication service disruption period which occurs during handoffs in a wireless local area network. While claim 18 is different from claim 1, the analysis of claim 18 with regard to Ogier is analogous to claim 1, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, applicant's independent claim 18 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that it is patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of

claim 18.

Claims 2-8 and 19-21 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 or 18, which have been shown to be allowable over the prior art reference. Accordingly, claims 2-8 and 19-21 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency from the allowable base claims, as well as the additional features recited therein and respectfully requests allowance of those claims.

Conclusion

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. If there are any questions, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below. While it is believed no fee is due, please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian S. Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For: Larry Liberchuk,  
Registration No.: 40,352

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9602  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

January 4, 2008